

Unit Assessment Handbook

Department of Education

Washburn University

Revised October, 2012

History and Development of the Unit Assessment System

The Department of Education has had a clearly identified and comprehensive assessment system for many years. Efforts have been made to ensure that candidate and unit assessments are consistent with the unit's conceptual framework, the mission of the university and the department, NCATE standards and the Kansas State Department of Education licensure standards. Assessment data or topics are discussed at every department faculty meeting as well as in various departmental committees, the unit assessment committee, the University Teacher Education Committee (UTEC) and with school partners.

The unit has been using various information technologies to assist with data collection and analysis. For a number of years we used the TaskStream electronic portfolio system. Candidates had to pay a fee for use of TaskStream, but it provided a central location for candidates to submit projects including their WUPA materials. However, we have gradually moved away from the TaskStream system due to the costs imposed on candidates and the university-wide adoption of the learning management system, ANGEL. We have continued to use surveys developed through Survey Monkey, but plans are underway to utilize other tools for data collection to make the integration with the WU student information system more efficient.

In the fall of 2010 the unit modified the assessment phases for candidates and reduced the number of phases from five to four. This change combined what had been phases two and three into one phase. The department has also implemented a departmental rubric (explained in a later section) to help ensure that our assessment of candidates is consistent.

In February 2011, following the NCATE visit, the unit began work to revise and upgrade the assessment management process. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences provided monies and support to assist in these efforts. The unit was able to obtain the services of Dr. Cecil Schmidt, a professor in computer information sciences and Dr. Donna LaLonde, WU Director of Assessment, to assist in the development of the new Education Data Management System (EDMS) and to better access and use data in the WU student information system (Banner). The department also initiated assessment retreats twice a year to review data on candidates and the unit. A Director of Assessment position was created in 2011 to help manage the unit assessment system. A unit assessment calendar was also developed which identifies which assessments are completed at what times and who is responsible for reviewing them.

EDMS has been an Access data base through which the unit can collect, organize and summarize data on candidates. Data has been collected on admissions, field experiences, program completers and formal test scores such as the PPST. EDMS is housed in a separate server that is password protected. Several pieces of data have been shared between EDMS and the university student information system. However, in early 2012 a

decision was made to incorporate more information on candidates into the Banner system and the EDMS system will be gradually phased out. This transition will improve efficiency and ensure sustainability. It will also allow the unit to benefit from university-wide distributed reporting efforts.

In 2012 the Department formally established a Unit Assessment Committee. Prior to this time assessments were reviewed by various committees including the Undergraduate Program Committee, the University Teacher Education Committee (UTEC) the Graduate Committee as well as department faculty in monthly faculty meetings. These committees will continue to review relevant, specific data. However it was felt there was a need for an overall assessment committee to monitor the unit assessment system and to more fully involve school district partners.

In 2012 the unit began requiring student teaching candidates to submit a Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) rather than the WUPA that had been used for many years. In addition, changes were made to the student teaching evaluation form used by the unit. These evaluations are completed by university supervisors and cooperating teachers. The new form is more closely aligned with the new Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP).

Staff Responsibilities

Department Chairperson

The Chairperson for the Department of Education is responsible for monitoring the overall assessment system. The department chair is the person responsible for reports such as the Title II reports (fall & spring), the PEDS report and the university annual assessment reports. The department chair maintains the record of candidate complaints.

Unit Director of Assessment

The Director of Assessment for the unit is responsible for the overall operation of the assessment system including monitoring unit, candidate, and program assessments. The current Unit Director of Assessment is Dr. Michael Rettig. The director helps ensure that data collected by the unit are systematically collected, aggregated, disaggregated, summarized, analyzed and shared with the professional community including the unit, UTEC, school district staff, the university and the Kansas State Department of Education. The director also works to ensure that assessments are fair, accurate, and consistent. The director serves as chair of the Unit Assessment Committee and conducts the unit assessment retreats.

Licensure Officer

The unit licensure officer (currently staffed by Tara Porter) keeps a record of program completers and is responsible for ensuring that candidates applying for licensure have met all program requirements.

Secretary II

The Secretary II position (currently staffed by Katy Etzel) compiles data on undergraduate admissions (Phase I), the unit advising survey and faculty/course evaluations each semester. This position has also assisted in the development and revisions of surveys used via the SurveyMonkey web site.

Office Assistant II

The office assistant II position collects information on the content test scores for candidates, including managing information from ETS. This position also collects admission data for candidates in the advanced programs, performs graduate checks and monitors capstone data for candidates in the advanced programs, prepares Title II reports (fall & spring) and assists with the PEDS report in the spring.

Unit Assessment Committee

The Unit Assessment Committee (UAC) helps to guide and monitor the unit assessment system including the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure continuous improvement for Initial and Advanced programs and the unit as a whole. The committee will review unit assessment data on a regular basis and make recommendations for changes as necessary. The committee will meet once or twice a semester and will report to the department chairperson and the unit faculty as a whole. Membership in the UAC consists of at least one faculty representative from the elementary-level programs, one faculty member representing graduate programs, one UTEC member representing P – 12 programs, one UTEC faculty member representing secondary programs, a student representative, at least two representatives from p-12 school partners, and the Unit Assessment Director.

Department and UTEC Faculty

Licensure programs are monitored by faculty members most closely aligned to that discipline. P-12 and secondary licensure programs are monitored by UTEC. Elementary education programs are monitored by faculty in the Department of Education and graduate programs are monitored by the graduate committee within the department.

Licensure Program	Faculty Member(s) Responsible
Elementary	Dr. Michael Rettig
Birth- Grade 3	Dr. McConnell-Farmer, Dr. Michael Rettig
Mid. School Math	Dr. Amy Nebesniak
Mid. School History/Social Studies	Dr. Tim Fry
Mid. School English	Dr. Carolyn Carlson
Adaptive Spec. Ed. Provisional	Dr. Michael Rettig, Dr. Gloria Dye

Secondary	UTEC
History 6-12	Dr. Rachel Goossen (Dept. of History)
Math 6-12	Dr. Donna LaLonde
Biology 6-12	Dr. Jason Emry, Dr. John Mullican (Dept. of Biology)
English 6-12	Dr. Danny Wade (Dept. of English)
Chemistry	Dr. Steve Angel (Dept. of Chemistry)
P-12	UTEC
Music (Instrumental, Vocal)	Dr. Cathy Hunt (Dept. of Music)
PE	Dr. Margie Miller (Dept. of Kinesiology)
Art	Ms. Lynda Miller (Dept. of Art)
Languages (Spanish, French, German)	Dr. Sophie Delahaye (Dept. of Modern Languages)
Graduate Programs	Dr. Sandy Tutwiler
Special Education	Dr. Gloria Dye, Dr. Michael Rettig
Reading Specialist	Dr. Carolyn Carlson
Building Level	Dr. Donna LaLonde
District Level	Dr. Donna LaLonde
C & I Technology	Dr. David Pownell

Assessment as a Comprehensive System

The unit collects and maintains data on three key elements:

1. Candidate assessment
2. Program Evaluation
3. Unit operations assessment

To help monitor the assessment system the unit has established a unit assessment calendar, a unit assessment committee (described above), conducts assessment retreats and has utilized the Argos reporting tool in the university information system.

Assessment Calendar

As a part of our comprehensive assessment system the unit has developed an assessment calendar which identifies when specific assessments are conducted and who reviews these data. The calendar includes candidate, program and unit operation assessments and helps to ensure that assessments are conducted on a systematic basis.

Assessment Retreats

The department holds assessment retreats twice a year (August & January). The purpose of these dedicated retreats is to review data on candidates and the unit as a whole and to make recommendations regarding changes as needed.

Argos Reports

Washburn University adopted the Argos reporting tool. This tool allows departments to access data in a more direct and easy way than with previous systems. There are several Argos reports currently available for faculty including the Student Profile. The student profile provides a way to access information on a candidate quickly and includes contact information, demographic information, academic information, including transcript information, GPA's, admission test data, and admission and transfer information.

Argos reports developed for the unit also include a listing of declared and/or admitted candidates by licensure program. These reports are intended to help the unit track how many candidates there are in each licensure program. In addition, Argos reports that help track candidate grades in courses linked to their licensure program have also been developed. Further, there are Argos reports that provide a summary of data on candidate content test scores.

CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT

Decisions about candidate performance and advancement through the program are based on multiple assessments and organized into four phases. These four phases are described below:

Candidate Assessment – Initial-Level Candidates

Phase 1 –Admission to Teacher Education

The requirements for admission to teacher education are clearly identified and available to candidates electronically or in print form. Candidates pursuing a Teacher Education Program (Elementary K-6, Secondary 6-12, All Levels PreK-12) must apply for and be granted Formal Admission to the Professional Teacher Education Program before being allowed to enroll in any upper division (300-400 level) Professional Teacher Education courses. Candidates must have completed at least 24 credit hours of general education coursework with a GPA of at least 2.75 including EN 101, MA 116, a social science course and a natural science course. Candidates must have completed ED 150 EPIC and ED 200 Educational Psychology (with a minimum grade of at least a C). Candidates must have an EPIC evaluation and a university professional recommendation. Candidates are required to have a GPA of at least 2.50 for all courses attempted. In addition candidates must submit official copies of scores for the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST). Minimum acceptable scores on the PPST include: Writing 172, Reading 173 and Mathematics 172. Candidates must submit an application including a signed

Professional Conduct and Dispositions Form. Applications for admission are reviewed three times a year (April, August & November). Data on candidates seeking admission to the teacher education program is summarized by unit support staff and reviewed by the undergraduate program committee three times a year. Candidates are promptly notified of the decision of the committee.

EPIC Evaluation

The Educational Participation in the Community (EPIC) class (ED 150) is a required introductory course required of all educational majors. As a part of the course requirements candidates spend approximately 35 hours in urban school classrooms. Candidates are evaluated by school staff using the EPIC evaluation form which is based on the unit's professional conduct and dispositions.

Phase II – Professional Development

Phase II for initial-level candidates begins when they are admitted to teacher education and extends until they are admitted to student teaching. This is a formative evaluation phase and their progress through methods courses is monitored by the undergraduate program committee primarily through an analysis of GPA's.

A summary evaluation of this phase that determines if candidates advance to Phase III involves a review of student teaching applications. Both cumulative and professional GPA's are reviewed as a part of this application process. Candidates must also provide a degree audit to show that all course work has been successfully completed.

To be eligible for student teaching candidates must; a) have filed a student teaching application; b) have completed all professional education courses with a grade of C or better prior to the student teaching semester; c) have completed all content area teaching specialty courses with a grade of C or better prior to the student teaching semester d) have completed all general education courses and courses in the content/specialty area prior to student teaching; e) have a cumulative professional education GPA of 2.75 or better, a specialty GPA of 2.75 or better, and an overall cumulative GPA of 2.50 or better; f) application must be approved by the Undergraduate Program committee.

Phase III – Program Completion (Student Teaching)

Phase III is the student teaching semester. There are a number of evaluations conducted during this phase including the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) (formally the Washburn University Performance Assessment – WUPA). A summary evaluation form is completed by university supervisors and cooperating teachers for each student teaching placement. The student teaching evaluation form was modified in the fall of 2012 to bring it more in line with the state Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP). The form also includes at least one item related to each of the five Student Learning Outcomes identified by the unit. The cut score for the summary evaluation form is 40/56.

A disposition form is also completed on student teachers and student teachers are required to submit data on their impact on student learning. Data on these assessments is reviewed regularly by department faculty.

KPTP (formally WUPA)

Candidates completing student teaching are required to complete and submit a performance assessment. For many years this performance assessment (Washburn University Performance Assessment – WUPA) was completed by candidates and reviewed by one WU faculty member and one outside reviewer. In the fall of 2012 the department changed this performance assessment to the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio which is scored by external reviewers trained by the Kansas State Department of Education. The cut score for the KPTP is 20/30.

Impact on Student Learning Survey

As a part of the student teaching requirements candidates at the initial-level are required to complete an impact on student learning survey. This survey asks candidates to indicate the percentage gains students in their classroom made on the lessons they conducted and report on their performance assessment. The survey asks candidates to identify and disaggregate gains based on gender, disabilities, and ESL status.

Phase IV - Follow-up of Program Completers

Phase IV involves collecting and analyzing data on the content test scores of candidates completing the various licensure programs. It also includes follow-up survey data completed by school district staff which is a part of our overall program assessments. These data are reviewed by unit faculty, UTEC and the unit Assessment Committee on an annual basis.

PLT and Content Test Scores

Licensure candidates at the initial level are required to take and pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) test. This assessment is part of Phase IV of the candidate assessment system. Successful completion of the content test(s) is not a graduation requirement. This assessment is a part of all the initial level licensure programs and there are different cut scores for each licensure program. All licensure candidates, initial and advanced are required to successfully pass content test(s) for their specific licensure program. Candidates are generally encouraged to take these tests late in their program of study. Candidates must sign up with ETS and may take the content tests in either print or computer formats. Candidates are required to obtain a passing score in order to apply for their teaching or specialist license with the state of Kansas. Data on the content test scores of both initial and advanced level candidates are reviewed annually by unit faculty, UTEC and the unit Assessment Committee.

Candidate Assessment – Advanced Programs

Phase I Admission

To be admitted to the graduate program a candidate must hold a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning and official transcripts of all undergraduate and graduate course work must be submitted to the Washburn Department of Education. Candidate will complete a declaration of program form and submit an application to the graduate programs as well as letters of reference. Candidates must have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher in the last 60 hours of coursework. In addition, candidates must successfully pass the Department of Education Graduate Admission Test, the GRE or the MAT. Candidates in the special education program can be admitted as licensure-only or as master's degree candidates. Candidates seeking admission to the graduate program submit an application and supportive materials. Applications for admission are reviewed three times a year (April, August & November). Data on candidates seeking admission to the teacher education program are summarized by unit support staff and reviewed by the graduate program committee three times a year. Candidates are promptly notified of the decision of the committee regarding their admission.

Graduate Admission Test

All candidates wishing to be admitted to a Graduate program in Education will be required to take and successfully pass one of three graduate admissions tests: GRE, MAT or the Department of Education Graduate Admission Test. A minimum passing score for the GRE is 480 or above for verbal reasoning, 480 or above for quantitative reasoning and 45 for analytical writing. The minimum passing score for the MAT is 394 or above. The GRE or MAT may be taken as many times as necessary.

The Graduate Admission Test is a written test given internally and designed to assess a students' ability to engage in well-focused and coherent discussions, and write insightful, logical, and compelling responses when presented with an education-related article. The candidate's use of vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure will be evaluated as well as the quality of their ideas. Candidates are given two hours to read a journal article provided by the department and write a response to it. The test is completed on campus on regularly scheduled dates and is monitored by a member of the Graduate committee. Two committee members who have not had the candidate in a class or serve as an advisor for the candidate evaluate the test. If there is a significant difference in scores (five points or more) a third reviewer is assigned. In addition, a third reviewer will be assigned if the two reviewers disagree and the result is a failing score. In order for the exam to count toward admissions requirements, students must receive an average score of 17/25 or above as measured by the Graduate committee rubric of writing and critical thinking. The Department of Education Graduate Admission Test (GAT) may be retaken one time. Candidates are notified about their performance score in a timely manner.

Phase II Professional Development

Phase II is a formative evaluation phase. Candidate progress through the programs are monitored by the graduate program committee at least once a year primarily through a review of course work and GPA's.

Phase III Program Completion and Follow-Up

Candidates must have a GPA of at least 3.0 and successfully complete a practicum or performance assessment. Practicum or internships are evaluated by unit faculty and p-12 partners. Completion of a capstone experience for the master's degree is also required.

Candidates in the unit can choose from one of five capstone options: thesis, action research project, comprehensive paper, portfolio/oral exam, or written comprehensive examination. Descriptions of each are provided in the department web site.

All capstones are evaluated by a three member capstone committee. Capstone committee members will include faculty in the major program area of the candidate and other faculty members or a p-12 partner as needed. Capstone work is evaluated as pass or fail based on a majority vote. Capstone experiences are evaluated based on five criteria and these include: knowledge, synthesis, critical thinking, communication and reflection. Additionally, some licensure programs use area-specific rubrics to determine if program area standards have been met.

Phase III also involves the follow-up of program completers. Content Test scores for candidates completing the programs are reviewed by the graduate committee. A follow-up study on program completers is also conducted as a part of this phase. An internship evaluation is conducted for building level and district level educational administration candidates.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Program evaluation is a review of data on candidates and the program as a whole using both internal and external sources of data. Program evaluations involve an examination of data collected on candidates as well as data that relates to the Student Learning Outcomes required by Washburn University and the data collected for the 21 licensure programs. Based on findings, recommendations may be made for program revisions or developing plans for improving instruction as necessary. Assessment data and reports reviewed can include:

- Licensure Program Assessments
- Aggregated and disaggregated PLT and Praxis II content test scores
- Licensure program assessments
- PLT/Content Test Scores
- Student teaching evaluations from cooperating teachers and university supervisors
- Field Experience placements

Candidate diversity proficiencies data
 Evaluation of professional dispositions
 Demographic information on schools and candidates
 Aggregated and disaggregated WUPA/KPTP data
 Follow-up Survey
 Student Teaching Retention Data
 Program Evaluation Surveys
 Education Interview Day Survey

Licensure Program Assessments

Each of the licensure programs offered by the unit regularly collects data on candidates working toward that licensure. Based on the KSDE program review requirements, the licensure programs generally include 6-8 assessments tied to the specific licensure standards for that program. Of these assessments, three are common across all programs at the initial level – the student teaching evaluation, the WUPA/KPTP and the content test scores of candidates. These three assessments are routinely monitored by the unit and UTEC. WUPA/KPTP scores and student teaching evaluations are reviewed each semester and content test scores are reviewed annually. A fourth assessment is also common to all licensure programs and that involves a review of specific content course work required for the licensure. The other 2-4 assessments in each licensure program are program specific and generally include scores on specific assignments completed within courses. Licensure program data are saved on secure network storage and available to all unit faculty and UTEC members. Licensure program data is organized by the assessments conducted to monitor candidate performance.

PLT and Content Test Scores

Licensure candidates at the initial level are required to take and pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) test. This assessment is part of Phase IV of the candidate assessment system. In addition, this assessment is a part of all the initial level licensure programs. All licensure candidates, initial and advanced are required to successfully pass content test(s) for their specific licensure program. Candidates are generally encouraged to take these tests late in their program of study. Candidates must sign up with ETS and may take the content tests in either print or computer formats. Specific cut scores have been established for each of these content tests. Candidates are required to obtain a passing score in order to apply for their teaching or specialist license with the state of Kansas. Data on the content test scores of both initial and advanced level candidates is reviewed at least annually by unit faculty. Data is examined as a whole as well as disaggregated by licensure program.

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) provides data to the unit on the content test and PLT scores of candidates and these data are incorporated into the university student information system.

ETS also sends a printed copy of names of candidates who have completed various content tests (generally in August for the prior academic year) and the unit has the opportunity to identify and confirm which of the candidates attended WU and whose names and scores should and should not be counted. The printed information is reviewed by unit staff and returned to ETS. Completed data from ETS on the content test scores of candidates is received by the unit usually in November and these data are used as the indicators of pass rates for the various licensure programs.

The unit reviews content test and PLT scores on an annual basis. Scores are reviewed as a whole and disaggregated by licensure program. Candidates in all licensure programs are required to have at least an 80% pass rate on the content tests.

Student Teaching Evaluations

Student teaching evaluations are part of Phase III of the candidate assessment system. However, this evaluation is a part of all the initial level licensure program assessments. Data is collected in both fall and spring semesters and is reviewed as a whole as well as disaggregated by licensure program. Student teaching evaluations are completed by university supervisors and by cooperating teachers. Items assessed with the student teaching evaluation include diversity, educational planning, assessment, use of technology and content knowledge.

Summary Evaluation Form

The unit decided to pilot the Summary Evaluation form in the fall of 2012 with the student teachers. The form will be completed by university supervisors and cooperating teachers during the student teaching semester (Phase III). This 13-item form has been adapted from, and is aligned with, the four constructs that make up the Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP). The items that make up this performance-based assessment are also aligned with our five Student Learning Outcome's.

Summary Evaluation Form Constructs:

1. Learner and Learning
2. Content Knowledge
3. Instructional Practice
4. Professional Responsibility

Field Experience Placements

Data is collected on the field placements of candidates at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Information on the course, school district, school, cooperating teacher, grade level and setting (e.g. rural, urban) are collected for each candidate. The EDMS utilizes a validation table to accurately identify the type (e.g. urban, rural) of district based on the entry of district number. Recording of grade levels consists of the use of six

codes – IFTD, infant/toddler, PREK – preschool, Prim – K-3, INTM – 4-6, MID – 6 -8 and SEC – 9-12. These data are reviewed on an annual basis by the unit faculty.

Evaluation of Professional Dispositions

The Department of Education Dispositions Committee, with input from the University Teacher Education Committee (UTEC), over the course of several years, created a list of professional behaviors and attitudes that are expected for teacher educators. The professional conduct and dispositions are a part of both the initial and advanced-level programs. This document, the Washburn University Department of Education Professional Conduct Dispositions, was approved by the departmental faculty and a process was put in place to ensure that candidates would understand and demonstrate these dispositions. Candidates learn about these dispositional expectations in their first exposure to the teaching profession, ED 150 EPIC (Early Participation in the Community) before being admitted to the program. Candidates read and sign the dispositions list to document that they agree to abide by these expectations. Throughout the program there are many points at which these expectations are reviewed and discussed, especially before any field-based experience. A signed dispositional form is placed in each candidate's departmental file.

A ten-item rubric was created for the purpose of evaluating professional dispositions in a university classroom or field-based setting consistent with the Professional Conduct Disposition statement signed by candidates described above. Dispositions are formally evaluated at three specific points in the teacher education program for initial-level candidates. The first formal evaluation occurs prior to admission to teacher education (Phase I). The EPIC mentor teacher submits the EPIC evaluation online. After the completion of EPIC, a professor or professional selected by the candidate completes the University/Professional Reference form. An overall score of 3.0 or above is required with indicators of performance at "developing" or above. Dispositional data are reviewed by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee as part of the decision to approve or deny the applicant admission to teacher education. Once admitted, assessment of dispositions occurs continuously through the three methods blocks in Phase II, but is considered formative data. Dispositional items are embedded in each practica evaluation rubric completed by the methods block professors who supervise candidates in classroom practicum settings with input from mentor teachers. The second formal evaluation of professional dispositions occurs online at the end of professional methods coursework (Phase II) by the Block C professor. The third formal dispositional assessment occurs at the close of the Student Teaching semester within the framework of the online Student Teacher Evaluation form completed by both the university supervisor and cooperating teacher at each Student Teaching field placement (Phase IV). Across clinical practice, university supervisors, professors, mentor teachers, and cooperating teachers observe and assess the candidate's dispositions.

Evaluation of Diversity Proficiencies

Evaluation of diversity competencies are completed throughout both the initial and advanced-level programs and are a part of the licensure program standards.

In addition, a competency that is found embedded throughout our professional conduct and dispositions and student teaching evaluation and is also a part of our conceptual framework and Student Learning Outcome's is:

“The candidate is accepting of diversity among people and makes decisions and adaptations that reflect a commitment to educational equity among students, including those with exceptionalities”.

This item is also a part of our Student Learning Outcomes and is assessed for all candidates completing student teaching. Data on this SLO is collected in both fall and spring semesters.

Candidate Diversity Dispositions

The Candidate Diversity dispositions survey is administered once a year in the fall semester. It is intended to help the department identify the opinions and perceptions of candidates regarding diversity. The evaluation focuses on attitudes rather than skills which are measured in field experiences. The 25-item form has statements reflecting attitudes regarding people from diverse backgrounds, cultures, beliefs, languages, etc. Candidates respond to these statements on a four point scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree). This information is summarized and reviewed by unit faculty at the annual assessment retreats and shared with the Unit Assessment committee.

Demographic Information on Schools and Candidates

The unit monitors the demographics of the schools as well as that of candidates. The Title II report prepared in the spring requires demographic information on candidates. We obtain this data from WU Institutional Research. Data on the demographics of school districts is obtained from the KSDE web site.

KPTP (formally WUPA)

Candidates completing student teaching are required to complete and submit a performance assessment which is a part of Phase III of the candidate assessment system. However, the performance assessment is a part of all the initial level licensure programs. For many years this performance assessment (Washburn University Performance Assessment – WUPA) was completed by candidates and reviewed by one WU faculty member and one outside reviewer. In the fall of 2012 the department changed this performance assessment to the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) which is scored by reviewers trained by the Kansas State Department of Education. The cut score for the KPTP was set at 20/30 based on input from KSDE.

The unit piloted the new Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) in the fall of 2012. The KPTP is divided into four components:

1. Contextual Information and Learning Environment Factors
2. Designing Instruction
3. Teaching and Learning
4. Reflection and Professionalism

Follow-Up Survey

The department conducts an annual survey of candidates who have completed the program. A survey which is consistent with our conceptual framework and professional standards is sent to school principals in the spring to assess the quality of our graduates. These data are reviewed on an annual basis by unit faculty.

The follow-up survey is a 12-item survey sent to school principals. It is intended to help us ensure that our graduates are competent and professional. The survey is aligned with elements of our conceptual framework and addresses diversity, assessment, use of technology, ethics, content knowledge and instructional planning:

1. Demonstrates strong content knowledge of the subject(s) taught
2. Plans thorough, well-organized lessons
3. Uses a variety of approaches and resources, including the use of technology, to provide instruction.
4. Shows evidence of reflection in planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction.
5. The student is accepting of diversity among people and makes decisions and adaptations that reflect a commitment to educational equity among students, including those with exceptionalities.
6. The teacher creates a respectful and inclusive learning community.
7. Addresses student behavior in an appropriate, positive and constructive manner
8. Manages instructional time well.
9. Communicates effectively with students, parents and staff
10. Demonstrates professional responsibility and abides by the ethics of the profession.
11. Makes use of appropriate formative and summative assessment to evaluate student learning.
12. Demonstrates an ability to help all students learn.

Teaching Retention Data

The unit makes an effort to determine how many candidates are working as educators in the schools after graduation.

Program Evaluation Surveys

Unit program evaluation surveys are conducted in the spring semester. These surveys are given to cooperating teachers and university supervisors involved in field placements as

well as UTEC members. The purpose of this survey is to obtain feedback on how well these partners know our assessment system, the conceptual framework and to assess the level of communication with the department.

The survey is scored by a rating scale and includes six items:

1. I am aware of the Department's Conceptual Framework.
2. I am aware of the Department's Professional Conduct and Disposition Policy for candidates.
3. I have collaborated with the Department in the design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences for teacher candidates in the Department.
4. I feel that members of the Department respond in an effective and timely manner to concerns or questions regarding candidates.
5. I feel that the evaluations of candidates are appropriate and valid.
6. I would describe my working relationship with the Department as good.

Education Interview Day Surveys

The Education Interview Day survey is conducted in conjunction with the Education Interview Days organized by the WU office of Career Services. The interview days are held twice a year. A survey is given to school district staff who come to campus to interview education majors.

UNIT OPERATION

Department Chair Evaluation

An evaluation of the department chair is conducted through the Dean's office once a year. Faculty members in the department are asked to provide feedback on the work of the chairperson for the previous calendar year.

Advising Survey

An advising survey is conducted each November. The purpose of this survey is to assess the quality of advising in the department. A random sampling of candidates across education courses and levels is conducted. The summarized results are discussed in department faculty meetings and provided to faculty for reporting in the annual activity reports.

Candidate Complaints

A record of candidate complaints is maintained by the department chairperson. The unit also monitors information from CAS as some complaints may go directly to the Dean's office.

Course/Faculty Evaluations

Faculty and course evaluations are completed at the end of each semester for every course. There are two forms completed – the evaluation from the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the SPOT (Student Perceptions of Teaching) which is used exclusively in the Department of Education. These two forms were compared a number of years ago to make sure that the items asked do not overlap. Candidates complete these evaluations in print and on-line and the summarized data is provided to faculty members at the beginning of the next semester. Faculty and course evaluations are reviewed by the Department Chair, the Department Personnel Committee and by the Dean of CAS. Course evaluation data is also provided in faculty third-year reviews and for promotion and tenure decisions.

Annual Faculty Activity Reports

Every January each faculty member in the department submits an annual activity report. These reports are organized into three sections – teaching, scholarship and service (see Annual Report Template). The reports cover the previous calendar year. The reports are reviewed by the Department Personnel committee and the Department Chair.

Demographics, Licensure and Qualifications of Cooperating Teachers

The unit attempts to ensure that cooperating teachers and other school-based partners who supervise candidates are qualified for their positions. In the summer of 2012 the unit requested data from the Kansas State Department of Education on the licensure and qualifications of teachers from the four area school districts in Shawnee County. KSDE provided an electronic file with more than 7700 records that has been incorporated into the WU operational data store. A review of our field experiences database indicates that more than 87% of placements are in these four area school districts. Information on teachers in other school districts is also collected and added to this database.

Internal and External Reports

WU Annual Assessment Report and Student Learning Outcome's

Washburn University requires each unit to submit an annual assessment report each June for the prior academic year. These reports are organized around Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) identified by each unit. The Department of Education submits assessment reports for the Elementary program, the Secondary and P-12 programs and for each graduate program separately (special education, reading, educational administration and C & I Technology). These reports are reviewed by the University Assessment Committee.

The five SLO's identified for the initial level candidates include:

1. Candidates demonstrate content knowledge and pedagogical skills.
2. Candidates demonstrate the ability to plan and implement instruction including the use of technology.
3. Candidates demonstrate that they are accepting of diversity among people and make decisions and adaptations that reflect a commitment to educational equity among students, including those with exceptionalities and reflect positive professional dispositions.
4. Candidates demonstrate that they can use assessment information for planning and decision making.
5. Candidates demonstrate that they have had a positive impact on P-12 student learning.

These SLO's are consistent with the department's conceptual framework and with KSDE licensure standards. The SLO's for the graduate programs are specifically linked to the KSDE teaching licensure standards.

NCATE Part C Report

The NCATE Part C report is submitted in April. Information provided in this report includes the number of program completers (initial and advanced), substantial changes in program delivery, addition or removal of preparation programs, significant changes in budget, enrollments or size of the faculty and a summary of activities to address any areas for improvement (AFI's).

AACTE PEDS Report

The Professional Education Data System (PEDS) report is due in April. The report includes information on the institution, professional education faculty, degree programs, number of candidates enrolled in various programs by gender and ethnicity, the number of candidates who have graduated, revenues and expenditures, technology education and clinical experiences.

Title II Report Card

Title II reports are submitted in the fall and spring. These reports include information on total enrollment with breakdowns by gender and ethnicity and the number of teachers prepared by subject area. The fall report primarily focuses on current enrollments and program completers. The spring report has information on the average number of clock hours required for student teaching, number of FTE faculty supervising clinical experiences and the number of adjunct faculty involved in field experiences is also required. The total number of candidates in clinical experiences and the total number of completers for the current and prior years are reported. Some information on how the program prepares candidates to incorporate technology and work with students with disabilities is also required.

Evidence of Fairness, Accuracy, and Consistency of Assessment Procedures

Fairness

Initial Programs:

The unit addresses fairness by ensuring that candidates have sufficient exposure to the knowledge and skills measured by unit assessment instruments. Curriculum maps completed by the Department of Education faculty in collaboration with the University Teacher Education Committee ensure that candidates have multiple opportunities to address the knowledge and skills embedded in state professional standards. An Assessment Matrix completed as a part of the university-wide assessment initiative shows the courses where departmental student learning outcomes are taught only, taught and assessed, or assessed only. KSDE professional standards have been connected with the indicators on unit assessments such as the student teaching evaluations and the *PLT*. KSDE content standards for specific licensure programs are linked directly with the *Praxis II* Content tests.

Candidates are introduced to the WUPA/KPTP, our department's comprehensive work sample project, before the end of their instructional coursework. Candidates in the K-6 elementary program create a mini-WUPA/KPTP during ED 320/325/327, the *Literacy Block* using the data from a literature-based unit. Candidates across secondary programs learn about the WUPA/KPTP during their content methods course. At the beginning of the student teaching semester, the process is again reviewed and the rubric for WUPA is thoroughly explained. The WUPA documents have been scored by two evaluators, one randomly-assigned faculty member and an outside evaluator trained by KSDE. Candidates had to achieve an average score of 3.5 from the two reviewers. In the spring of 2009 the department faculty put in place the required cut score and WUPA procedures. In the fall of 2012 the unit began a pilot of the new KPTP for initial-level candidates.

Candidates in student teaching understand the role the student teaching evaluation plays in program completion. An overall score of 3.0, Target, had to be achieved on the student teaching evaluation. A four point rating scale has been in effect since fall of 2007. Prior to that time a five point scale was in effect. To ensure fairness in the overall scoring, the scale was adjusted to ensure a scoring value of zero rather than one when a behavior or skill was not observed. The Student Teacher Evaluation is completed online by two evaluators, the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor, after completion of the student teaching assignment. These procedures ensure that candidates receive a fair evaluation by two professionals that have observed them teach.

The unit's disposition assessment process calls for all initial licensure candidates to be introduced to unit dispositions in the introductory education course, ED 150 Early Participation in the Community (EPIC). This is a program requirement for all candidates. Designed by the faculty after a two-year process, this document lists ten dispositional statements describing the behaviors and attitudes expected for teacher educators. Candidates sign the Professional Conduct Dispositions statement before being admitted to the program. The dispositions of candidates are assessed at three points in their

professional program: after completion of EPIC and prior to admission of teacher education, after completion of professional methods coursework, and at the close of the student teaching semester. The unit's disposition policy clearly states the role of disposition assessment in program completion. To ensure fairness, the responsibility for assessment of dispositions is shared across clinical practice by university supervisors, professors, mentor teachers, and cooperating teachers. Procedures are in place for dealing with candidates who might exhibit unacceptable behaviors or attitudes. Issues not resolved by the faculty or supervisor involved are directed to a Professional Dispositions Committee. To ensure fairness, the candidate may appeal any actions to the Department Chair, the Teacher Education Committee, and then the Dean of Students.

Advanced Programs

Curriculum maps have been developed to align courses with the professional standards for licensure within specific advanced licensure programs (Building Leadership, District Leadership, Special Education, and the Reading Specialist programs). Alignment is further made between program standards and the specific indicators that appear on both the *Practicum Evaluation Forms* and the licensure rubrics. Faculty in these specific program areas work closely with candidates as both advisors and through course content to ensure that all candidates understand that satisfactory completion of both practicum and the capstone experience are required in order to complete their program.

To ensure fairness, Admission to Advanced Programs allows a candidate to take a free written departmental test (GAT) offered once each semester. The rubric for scoring is provided to the candidates along with the exam. Two randomly-assigned graduate faculty evaluate each exam and the scores are averaged with an overall cut score of 17 (out of 25). A third reader is used if there is a significant difference in scores or if the two reviewers disagree and it results in a failing score. Each candidate taking the exam is assigned a code to protect their identity and the one graduate committee member who knows the code/name of the candidate does not score any of the exams. Candidates may retake the GAT exam once or the candidate may take either the MAT or GRE standardized tests. Established scores for admission are indicated on the list of admission requirements that may be found in admissions material distributed by the department, the University catalogue, and online. The graduate committee reviews the scores from the graduate admission test and has made changes in the format and structure of this exam to ensure fairness.

The disposition process and procedures described for undergraduates is also in place for advanced candidates. The Professional Conduct Dispositions form is modified slightly for graduates and must be signed prior to practicum experiences. Assessment of dispositions is conducted through observation and evaluation of practicum experiences using established rubrics described above.

Accuracy

Initial Programs

The unit has taken care to structure assessments to provide the most accurate and effective means for gathering knowledge, skills, and dispositions data. As a result, the unit uses assessments such as standardized exams, grade point averages, and rubrics to measure appropriate areas of candidate development (i.e., knowledge, skills, and dispositions). Data on candidates is compiled by support staff and provided to faculty at various committee meetings. The unit uses an assessment system to monitor each candidate's progress and candidates are tracked through the program at four major checkpoints: Admission to Teacher Education (Phase I), Evaluation of Professional Practice (Phase II), Candidacy for Program Completion (Phase III), and Program Completion (Phase IV). After graduation, Licensure/Post-Professional Performance (Phase V) is the collection and review of data on graduates pursuing attainment of licensure and teaching positions. Required course completion for each program, four specific grade point averages (general education, professional education, specialty and cumulative GPAs), recommendations and evaluations from professors, mentors, cooperating teachers and university supervisors, as well as standardized assessment scores, and performance assessment evaluations are used to determine successful completion of one phase and/or admission to the next phase of the program or program completion. Candidates for licensure must pass two standardized national examinations of content and pedagogy before initial licensure is attained.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in advanced licensure programs pass through similar assessment points: Admission to the specific advanced program (Phase I), Evaluation of Professional Practice (Phase II), Candidacy for Program Completion (Phase III), Program Completion (Phase IV), and Follow-up of Program Completers (Phase V). For each candidate, knowledge is assessed using grade point averages, Capstone Evaluation rubrics, and Praxis II standardized test data. Data on candidates' skills and dispositions is collected through field-based observations using program specific Practicum Observation rubrics. The unit ensures that assessments match the knowledge and skills described in KSDE standards. All assessments primarily use the language of standards as performance indicators. Candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills described by the licensure standards in appropriate contexts (i.e., field or clinical setting). Accuracy is also supported by correlation studies completed by the unit (see Unit Assessment Studies).

Consistency

Initial and Advanced Programs

The unit ensures consistency by using multiple raters on many undergraduate and graduate assessments and multiple sources of information are used when making judgments about candidates. At the undergraduate level, one faculty rater was randomly assigned to assess each WUPA along with an outside rater and these scores were compared. Beginning in the fall 2012 the KPTP will be reviewed by an external

reviewer. Department faculty also reviewed candidates KPTP's to determine if scores obtained are consistent with those obtained from the state. For the Student Teacher Evaluations for initial licensure, candidates are rated by both the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. In Advanced Programs multiple evaluators observe and rate candidates as they work in the field or clinical settings. The graduate admissions test is scored by two graduate faculty members not connected to the candidate's program. A team of three professionals serve on capstone committees to evaluate advanced candidate capstones. The unit ensures consistency by conducting inter-rater reliability studies on assessments requiring two or more evaluators and reviewing data in departmental meetings.

Another means of providing consistency is training for those persons evaluating candidates. WUPA/KPTP raters have all received training at the initial level. Practicum evaluation indicators have been discussed between university supervisors and practicum evaluators at both levels.

The department also uses a consistent grading rubric. The rubrics that assess knowledge or skills within the Department of Education's assessment system use consistent performance level terms with the following descriptors:

Advanced (4) -- Candidate demonstrates exceptional understanding and/or skills required for a teaching professional relevant to this standard or criteria.

Target (3) -- Candidate demonstrates an acceptable understanding and/or skills required for a teaching professional relevant to this standard or criteria.

Developing (2) -- Candidate demonstrates a growing understanding and/or skills required for a teaching professional relevant to this standard or criteria.

Unacceptable (1) -- Candidate demonstrates a minimal understanding and/or skills required for a teaching professional relevant to this standard or criteria.

Not Demonstrated -- Candidate has not demonstrated knowledge and/or skills regarding this standard or criteria.

Some rubrics use some but not all performance levels. For example, only "Target," "Developing," and "Unacceptable" are used on Lesson Plan rubrics used to gather data for the Lesson Plan Collection.

By using consistent descriptors with the same performance expectations, professors, university supervisors, mentor teachers, cooperating teachers in all courses and clinical practice are judging performance in a similar fashion. Descriptions of the performance levels appear on all evaluation forms. Explanations of these levels are discussed in meetings and training sessions for mentor teachers and cooperating teachers who assist in the evaluation of candidates in field-based placements. Qualitative descriptions have been converted to a quantitative score on various departmental rubrics. Performance is expected to vary across indicators to expose strengths and weaknesses, and, as candidates move through the program, their performance is expected to change as they grow in the knowledge and skills of teaching. Performance may be at the "Developing" level during Phase II within professional methods courses. However, by the end of their teacher

education program, each program completer in Phase IV is expected to demonstrate overall knowledge/skills at the "Target" level on the Student Teacher Evaluation (3.0 or above) and on the Washburn University Performance Assessment (3.5 or above).

Fairness and Avoidance of Bias

The unit ensures its assessments are free of bias by using assessments linked closely with the language of state and professional standards and indicators. By doing so, the unit ensures that language, racial/ethnic stereotypes, or cultural insensitivity that might interfere with the performance of some candidates are excluded. Depending on the type of assessment, the unit ensures fairness by making sure the assessment takes place in appropriate contexts and that distractions are not present that might negatively impact candidates' performance. We make use of multiple measures and assessments that are scored anonymously by more than one evaluator. Statements are placed on syllabi to encourage candidates with disabilities to seek accommodations when needed. A record of formal student complaints and resolutions is maintained by the department chairperson. The university also has a formal system of dispute resolution for students.

Table I
Assessment Transition Points for Candidate Performance

	Phase I Admissions	Phase II Professional Development (Formative)	Phase III Program Completion (Student Teaching)	Phase IV Follow-up of Program Completers
Elementary Education	General Ed GPA - 2.75 Professional GPA – C or better (in courses taken) Specialty GPA – C or better (in courses taken) Cumulative GPA 2.5 PPST Scores Professional Rec. – 2.5 EPIC Dispositions – 2.5	Mini-WUPA Disposition Evaluations General Ed GPA – 2.75 Professional GPA 2.75 Specialty GPA 2.75 Cumulative GPA 2.5 <i>Successful Degree Audit</i>	WUPA – 3.5 Student Teacher Evaluation including Dispositions – 3.0	PLT Performance Content Test Performance Unit Program Completer/Employer Follow-up Survey
Secondary Education	General Ed GPA – 2.75 Professional GPA – C or better (in courses taken) Specialty GPA – C or better (in courses taken) Cumulative GPA 2.5 PPST Scores Professional Rec. – 2.5 EPIC Dispositions – 2.5	General Ed GPA – 2.75 Professional GPA 2.75 Specialty GPA 2.75 Cumulative GPA 2.5 WUPA Portfolio Evaluation (Abbreviated) Disposition Evaluation	WUPA – 3.5 Student Teacher Evaluation – 3.0	PLT Performance Content Test Performance Unit Program Completer/Employer Follow-up Survey
P-12 Education	General Ed GPA – 2.75 Professional GPA – C or better (in courses taken) Specialty GPA – C or better (in courses taken) Cumulative GPA 2.5 PPST Scores Professional Rec. – 2.5 EPIC Dispositions – 2.5	General Ed GPA – 2.75 Professional GPA 2.75 Specialty GPA 2.75 Cumulative GPA 2.5 WUPA Portfolio KPA Portfolio Evaluation (Abbreviated) Disposition Evaluation	WUPA – 3.5 Student Teacher Evaluation – 3.0	PLT Performance Content Test Performance Unit Program Completer/Employer Follow-up Survey

Hyperlinks to list of forms:

EPIC evaluation

Graduate Admission Test rubric

Diversity Dispositions survey

Advising Survey

CAS course evaluation form

SPOT evaluation form

Graduate Disposition form

Graduate capstone eval

KPTP evaluation – WUPA eval form

Old student teaching eval

new student teaching eval

[Student Teaching Application](#)

[Content & PLT Tests](#)

[Graduate Application Form](#)

[Professional Conduct & Dispositions Form - Graduate](#)

[Dispositions and Conduct Report Form](#)

Hyperlinks to sample reports:

Licensure program assessments

Undergraduate admissions lists

Graduate admissions lists

Student teaching admit lists

Content test scores – by licensure program – initial and advanced

Argos report on declared and/or admitted candidates

Argos student profile report

Program evaluation survey data

Follow-up of program completer's data

Field experiences data

Impact on student learning data